

CONFIDENTIAL

Minutes of Extraordinary
Session of the OC Executive
Board - 12 August 1976

The following members were in attendance:



AGENDA ITEM #1 - Provision of positions for communications activities outside of the Office of Communications proper - specifically DD/S&T, OEL, NPIC, etc.

1. Mr. [] introduced the item with the comment that there had been a recent turn down of assignment of an OC careerist to an OEL position with an "MC" career designation. This occurrence raised a question of the need to restudy OC philosophy on positions located within and controlled by other Agency components but which are to be filled by OC careerists. Under the circumstances the other organization can demand the final say. The system for OC controlled positions is that the career service nominates and sends personnel in accordance with availability within career specialties and they are accepted by the gaining OC component. This system has generally resulted in an equitable distribution of talent. With the growing number of communications positions outside OC control, we could get into a situation where assignability could become a severe problem. The question is one of whether we should move for a return of communications positions to OC. One possible approach would be for OC to establish a communications team using positions obtained for the project development stage and that the positions would be transferred to OC when the project goes operational on a long term basis. Comment was requested.

E3 IMPDET
CL BY []

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

2. During the discussion which followed, Mr. [] agreed that there is a need to return long term positions to OC cognizance but suggested that we should designate positions as being at the directorate support level rather than at the component level. The positions could then be used to staff short term projects. In cases of projects with long start-up times or where security considerations rule out rotational manning, project positions could be designated for long term, non-rotational OC manning. Mr. [] commented that in the past efforts had been made to get OC positions for a DD/S&T project. The efforts were unsuccessful because of the lack of support from DD/S&T. He also expressed concern about possible ceiling problems. Mr. [] expressed mixed feelings on the matter. First, there would be some concern about ceiling and salary - possibly the budget could be restructured into two budgets, one for traditional OC core activities and one for external projects. Second, in cases where a project involved two or three positions only, OC would be expected to "eat" the requirement. Third, we cannot base our case on a single incident - better and stronger justification will be required. Mr. [] commented that OD&E would probably not fight our proposal. He also mentioned that there is a feeling of isolation from the mainstream on the part of some OC careerists assigned to OEL. Mr. [] commented that Mr. Blake understands and appreciates the OC career management system. The big bottom line could prove to be a problem; however, there should be a complete OC career service embracing all positions as well as all personnel. One approach which could be taken is to follow the pattern for leased lines - initial year plus one year ceiling and funding would be supplied by the customer to allow time for orderly programming by OC to meet the requirement. Mr. [] mentioned three problem areas: (1) The risk of budget and ceiling cuts would be shifted from DD/S&T to OC. (2) There is a need for a good representation on the problem to DD/S&T. (3) Timing of the presentation is critical - this problem should not be intermingled with the question of the future of R&D.

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

3. Mr. [] summed up the conclusions as follows:

a. There is agreement with the philosophy that there should be a single OC career management service encompassing positions and personnel.

b. The management system which now operates one way to support DDO and another to support DD/S&T should operate one way only. The directorate requiring support should provide short range ceiling and budget support for one to two years to allow for orderly OC programming of the support.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

c. We must carefully consider timing of our presentation first to Mr. Blake and later to the EAG. This should be after resolution of the future of R&D.

d. Communications support should be provided at the directorate level within DD/S&T rather than having an OEL or other Office of Communications staff.

AGENDA ITEM #2 - KE Communications to Remote Sites

25X1

Not for the Record.



APPROVED:



Director of Communications

8-24-76
Date

Distribution:

1 Each OC Executive Board Member

CONFIDENTIAL